



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,964	12/18/2001	Roger T. Baird	10012975-1	4830

7590 07/28/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ELMORE, JOHN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,964

Applicant(s)

BAIRD ET AL.

Examiner

John Elmore

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/18/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by Redlich et al. (US 2002/0091734), hereafter Redlich.

**Regarding claim 1, 2, 7-9, 17, 18 and 21-23**, Redlich discloses a method comprising:

receiving a request (120) for a document (para. 0078, lines 2-4);  
identifying a source of the request (identifying user; para. 0086, lines 21-25);  
determining an authorization level (security clearance level) associated with the source of the request (para. 0078, lines 4-13);  
determining an authorization level (security clearance level) required to view the requested document (para. 0078, lines 4-13);



if the source of the request is authorized to receive the requested document, transmitting the requested document to the source of the request (full document transmitted from server upon validation of proper security clearance; para. 0067; para. 0078; para. 0084; para. 0087, lines 7-10); and

if the source of the request is not authorized to receive the requested document, redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document and transmitting the redacted version of the requested document to the source of the request (partial document transmitted where security clearance not sufficient for full document access; para. 0078 and para. 0087).

**Regarding claim 2**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that determining an authorization level required to view the requested document includes determining a plurality of required authorization levels, wherein each required authorization level is associated with a different portion of the requested document (multiple security clearances for different portions of the requested document; para. 0087).

**Regarding claim 7**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that identifying a source of the request includes identifying a user ID associated with the source of the request (para. 0086, lines 21-25).

**Regarding claim 8**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that determining an authorization level required to view the requested document includes determining an authorization level required to view the complete requested document (para. 0087).



**Regarding claim 9**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that determining an authorization level required to view the requested document includes determining an authorization level required to view at least a portion of the requested document (para. 0087).

**Regarding claims 17, 18 and 21-23**, this is a computer-readable-media version of the method claimed above (claims 1, 2 and 7-9, respectively). For the reasons applied above, such claims also are anticipated.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 3, 5, 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Redlich.

**Regarding claim 3**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that redacting unauthorized portions involves reconstructing portions of a document from storage that constitute less than its whole (para. 0087). But Redlich does not explicitly explain that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes deleting the unauthorized portions of the requested document.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that reconstructing a document where unauthorized portions of the



Art Unit: 2134

original are omitted serves the same function as first reconstructing the whole document and then removing the unauthorized portions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to delete the unauthorized portions of the requested document for the motivation of providing a redacted version of the document.

**Regarding claim 5**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that the requested document includes an image (document contains images; para 0072).

But Redlich does not explicitly explain that the image has an associated required authorization level. However, Redlich teaches that a document has multiple authorization levels (security clearance levels) associated with different partial reconstructions of a document (para 0087). The Examiner takes official notice that one of ordinary skill would recognize that an image has an associated required authorization level where a first partial reconstruction is differentiated from a second partial reconstruction by a single authorization level and that the only difference between the two partial reconstructions is the presence of the image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide that the image has an associated required authorization level for the motivation of providing partial reconstructions of a document that are highly granular.

**Regarding claim 6**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and further teaches that the requested document includes an audio file (document contains sound bites and video files; para 0072).



But Redlich does not explicitly explain that the audio file has an associated required authorization level. However, Redlich teaches that a document has multiple authorization levels (security clearance levels) associated with different partial reconstructions of a document (para 0087). The Examiner takes official notice that one of ordinary skill would recognize that an audio file has an associated required authorization level where a first partial reconstruction is differentiated from a second partial reconstruction by a single authorization level and that the only difference between the two partial reconstructions is the presence of the audio file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide that the audio file has an associated required authorization level for the motivation of providing partial reconstructions of a document that are highly granular.

**Regarding claim 19**, this is a computer-readable-media version of the method claimed above (claim 3). For the reasons applied above, such a claims also would have been obvious.

6. **Claims 4, 10-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Redlich in view of Schneck et al. (US 5,933,498), hereafter Schneck.

**Regarding claim 4**, Redlich teaches all the limitations of claim 1, but Redlich does not explicitly explain that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document.



However, Schneck teaches a method of securely distributing legal documents wherein redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document for the purpose of limiting access of unauthorized users to the non-redacted portions of the document while still indicating the placement where which such portions exist in the document (blacking out all redacted words; col. 33, lines 51-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Redlich with the teaching of Schneck to provide that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document. One would be motivated to do so to limit access of unauthorized users to the non-redacted portions of the document, particularly where the requested document is a legal document or where it is otherwise useful to illustrate to the user where such unauthorized portions exist in the document.

**Regarding claim 10**, Redlich discloses a method comprising:

determining an authorization level (security clearance level) required to view the requested document (para. 0078, lines 4-13);

determining an authorization level (security clearance level) associated a current user (para. 0078, lines 4-13);

if the current user is authorized to receive the requested document, displaying the document (full document reconstructed upon validation of proper security clearance; para. 0078; para. 0087, lines 7-10); and



if the current user is not authorized to receive the requested document, redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document and transmitting the redacted version of the requested document to the source of the request (partial document reconstructed where security clearance not sufficient for full document access; para. 0078 and para. 0087).

But Redlich does not explicitly explain receiving a document (that is, prior to reconstruction/redaction).

However, Schneck teaches receiving a document (packaged data 108) as a step prior to redaction of the document for the purpose of facilitating access to the entire document or portions of the document at any time thereafter, according to a set of access rules (116), without having to retransmit the document to the user (Fig. 5; col. 9, lines 46-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Redlich with the teaching of Schneck to provide for receiving a document. One would be motivated to do so in order to facilitate subsequent access to the entire document or portions of the document at any time thereafter without having to retransmit the document to the user.

**Regarding claim 11**, the modified method of Redlich and Schneck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, and Redlich and Schneck further teach that determining an authorization level required to view the requested document includes determining a plurality of required authorization levels, wherein each required authorization level is associated with a different portion of the requested document (multiple security



clearances for different portions of the requested document; para. 0087). Therefore, for the reasons applied above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

**Regarding claim 12**, the modified method of Redlich and Scnheck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, and Redlich and Scnheck further teach that redacting unauthorized portions involves reconstructing portions of a document from storage that constitute less than its whole (Redlich: para. 0087). But Redlich and Scnheck do not explicitly explain that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes deleting the unauthorized portions of the requested document.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that reconstructing a document where unauthorized portions of the original are omitted serves the same function as first reconstructing the whole document and then removing the unauthorized portions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to delete the unauthorized portions of the requested document for the motivation of providing a redacted version of the document.

**Regarding claim 13**, the modified method of Redlich and Scnheck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, but Redlich and Scnheck do not explicitly explain that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document.

However, Schneck teaches a method of securely distributing legal documents wherein redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document for the purpose of limiting



access of unauthorized users to the non-redacted portions of the document while still indicating the placement where which such portions exist in the document (blacking out all redacted words; col. 33, lines 51-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the modified method of Redlich and Schneck with the further teaching of Schneck to provide that redacting unauthorized portions of the requested document includes visually blurring the unauthorized portions of the requested document. One would be motivated to do so to limit access of unauthorized users to the non-redacted portions of the document, particularly where the requested document is a legal document or where it is otherwise useful to illustrate to the user where such unauthorized portions exist in the document.

**Regarding claim 14**, the modified method of Redlich and Schneck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, and Redlich and Schneck further teach that the requested document includes an image (document contains images; para 0072).

But Redlich and Schneck do not explicitly explain that the image has an associated required authorization level. However, Redlich and Schneck teach that a document has multiple authorization levels (security clearance levels) associated with different partial reconstructions of a document (Redlich: para 0087). The Examiner takes official notice that one of ordinary skill would recognize that an image has an associated required authorization level where a first partial reconstruction is differentiated from a second partial reconstruction by a single authorization level and that the only difference between the two partial reconstructions is the presence of the



image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide that the image has an associated required authorization level for the motivation of providing partial reconstructions of a document that are highly granular.

**Regarding claim 15**, the modified method of Redlich and Schnheck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, and Redlich and Schnheck further teach displaying the image if the current user is authorized to view the image (Redlich: para. 0087). Therefore, for the reasons applied above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

**Regarding claim 16**, the modified method of Redlich and Schnheck is relied upon as applied to claim 10, and Redlich and Schnheck further teach redacting the image if the current user is not authorized to view the image (Redlich: para. 0087). Therefore, for the reasons applied above, such a claim also would have been obvious.

**Regarding claim 20**, this is a computer-readable-media version of the method claimed above (claim 4). For the reasons applied above, such a claims also would have been obvious.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anderson et al. (US 5,701,342) discloses a method for complex document security.



Humes (US 5,996,011) discloses a method for filtering content wherein unauthorized portions are deleted.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Elmore whose telephone number is 571-272-4224. The examiner can normally be reached on M 10-8, T-Th 9-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Morse can be reached on 571-272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JE

David Y. Jung  
Primary Examiner

2/21/05

